Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 are amended. Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being not particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter of the claimed invention. In particular, claim 3 included "...a mobile communication terminal identification address for identifying a mobile communication terminal capable of having a plurality of communication interfaces...," and the Action rejected the term "capable of" as a functional language not clearly limiting the claim.

Claim 3 is amended to recite "...a mobile communication terminal identification address for identifying a mobile communication terminal having a plurality of communication interfaces...." Since amended claim 3 does not recite "capable of," the 112 rejection of claim 3 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fyte (U.S. Patent 5,428,666). Claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Raviv (U.S. Publication 2002/0,164,983). Applicant submits that the claims patently distinguish over the cited art.

Claims 1 and 6

Claim 1 as amended is as follows:

> A mobile communication terminal comprising:
> a plurality of communication interfaces;
> a communication interface selecting section which selects a communication interface via the mobile communication terminal transmits data, from the plurality of communication interfaces;
> a terminal identification address assigning section which assigns a terminal identification address for identifying the mobile communication terminal to the data;
> a communication interface identification address assigning section which assigns a communication interface identification address for identifying the selected communication interface to the data; and
> a transmitting section which transmits the data being assigned with the two kinds of addresses via the selected communication interface.

Fyte does not teach or suggest, at least, the "communication interfaces" of claim 1. And Fyte accordingly does not teach or suggest limitations incorporating and referencing the "communication interfaces," including "a communication interface selecting section which selects a communication interface via the mobile communication terminal transmits data, from the plurality of communication interfaces."

Concerning those limitations of claim 1, an example is provided in applicant's specification at FIG. 2 and the accompanying text. A mobile communication terminal 100 having a plurality of communication interfaces 102a-102c is provided. Each of the communication interfaces 102a-102c is connected to a communication network 108a-108c. The mobile communication terminal 100 communicates with the mobile communication managing apparatus 200 via the communication interfaces 102a-102c. (See also applicant specification at page 18, line 14 – page 19, line 24).

The Action argues that the number assignment modules (NAMs) of Fyte as corresponds to the "communication interfaces" of claim 1. However, the NAMS are not interfaces, and the mobile communication terminal does not transmit data via the NAMs. On the contrary, the number assignment modules (NAMs) are just memory modules storing information about the mobile communication terminal. For example, Fyte at col. 1, lines 44-51 teaches that the NAMs store SID identifying the mobile phone's home system and MIN representing the phone number of the mobile phone. The NAMs are not part of the data transmission apparatus, and the transmitted data does not pass through the NAMs to reach the transmission destination. Thus, the mobile phone does not transmit data via the memory module.

Moreover, the Fyte at col. 4, lines 3-6 indicates that the NAMs are implemented with random access memory (RAM). A RAM stores data, but does not transmit data. Thus, implanting NAMs with a RAM further evidences that the NAMs are not part of the data transmission apparatus, via which the mobile phone transmits data.

For the above reasons, the 102(b) rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn. Amended claim 6 recites limitations not taught or suggested by Fyte as discussed above, including "selecting a communication interface via which the mobile communication terminal transmits data, from a plurality of communication interfaces." Thus, the 102(b) rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn for the same reasons as claim 1. Withdrawal of the 102(b) rejections to claims 1 and 6 and allowance of those claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 7

Concerning the 102(b) rejection of claim 3 over Raviv, applicant submits that Raviv does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 3.

Claim 3, as recited, recites:

> A mobile communication managing apparatus comprising:
> a mobile communication terminal side receiving section which receives data that is assigned with two kinds of addresses including a mobile communication terminal identification address for identifying a mobile communication terminal having a plurality of communication interfaces and a communication interface identification address for identifying a communication interface of the mobile communication terminal;
> an address storing section which stores an address table in which the mobile communication terminal identification address and the communication interface identification address that are assigned to the received data are associated with each other;
> a communication apparatus side transmitting section which transmits the data received by the mobile communication terminal side receiving section to a certain destination;
> a communication apparatus side receiving section which receives data being assigned with a mobile communication terminal identification address;
> a communication interface detecting section which detects a communication interface identification address that corresponds to the mobile communication terminal identification address being assigned to the data received by the communication apparatus side receiving section based on the address table; and
> a mobile communication terminal side transmitting section which transmits the data received by the communication apparatus side receiving section via the detected communication interface.

Raviv does not teach or suggest "a mobile communication terminal...having a plurality of communication interfaces" and the limitations incorporating the "communication interfaces." The Action apparently identifies the mobile device of FIG. 3 as the "mobile communication terminal" of claim 3. The Action, **however,** does not identify the "communication interfaces" of the mobile communication terminal. An example of the mobile communication managing apparatus is provided in FIG. 2 of applicant's specification and the accompanying text. FIG. 3 illustrates that the mobile communication managing apparatus communicates with a communication apparatus 500 ("a certain destination") via network 350. The mobile communication managing apparatus also communicates with a mobile communication terminal 100 having a plurality of communication interfaces 102. As discussed above, an example of a "communication interface" is an interface via which the mobile

communication terminal connects to a network, and the mobile communication terminal connects to a plurality of networks (108) via the "communication interfaces" (102)(applicant's specification at FIG. 2 and the accompanying text).

Raviv does not teach or suggest "a mobile communication terminal ...having a plurality of communication interfaces" as required. The Action contends that the interface apparatus 300, illustrated in FIG. 3 of Raviv, corresponds to the "mobile communication managing apparatus" of claim 3. The Action further contends the mobile device of FIG. 3 as the "mobile communication terminal" of claim 3, and the side communicating with the service network as the a communication apparatus side of claim 3. Concerning the mobile device ("mobile communication terminal"), Raviv does not teach or suggest the mobile device includes a plurality of communication interfaces. For example, at para. 0245, Raviv states, "Each roaming mobile telephone device is associated with a home mobile network." (Emphasis added). Since each mobile telephone communicates with only one home mobile network, the mobile telephone would have only one communication interface. No disclosure supporting the mobile telephone having more than one communication interface can be found in Raviv. (Applicant further notes that the Action does not expressly identify the "communication interfaces" within the mobile device of Raviv.)

Further, given that Raviv does not teach the required "mobile communication terminal ...having a plurality of communication interfaces," Raviv cannot disclose the "communication interface identification address" identifying a communication interface of the mobile communication terminal. Because the mobile device of Raviv has but one communication interface, it requires no "communication interface identification address" to identify the only interface. (Applicant further notes that the Action does not expressly identify the "communication interface identification address" disclosed Raviv.)

The Action argues that Raviv at paras. 249 and 250 discloses the above limitations. The cited paragraphs do not. On the contrary, para. 249 discloses the interface apparatus 300 analyzing a data request to identify the requesting device ("Device identifier 340 uses data request parameters to identify the device which sent the data request."). Para. 250 discloses using the result of the analysis to determine to which service network (the "certain destination" of claim 3) the data request needs to be directed ("The result of the request analysis are utilized by service network selector 320 to determine the service network the data request should be directed to."). No disclosure for the required "mobile communication terminal ...having a plurality of communication interfaces" and

"communication interface identification address" identifying a communication interface of the mobile communication terminal can be found in paras. 0249 and 0250.

Likewise, Raviv does not teach or suggest "an address storing section which stores an address table in which the mobile communication terminal identification address and the communication interface identification address that are assigned to the received data are associated with each other," because Raviv does not even teach or suggest the "mobile communication interface identification address." The "address table" requires both the "mobile communication interface identification address" and the associated "mobile communication terminal identification address," and therefore, Raviv does not teach or suggest the required "address table."

Moreover, as discussed above, the Action fails to identify the structures corresponding to the limitations of claim 3, such as "communication interfaces" and "a mobile communication terminal ...having a plurality of communication interfaces." Applicant respectfully submits that the claim 3 should be allowable accordingly. Should the Office disagrees, the Office is invited to identify those elements in Raviv.

For the above reasons, the 102(b) rejection of claim 3 should be withdrawn. Amended claim 7 recites limitations not taught or suggested by Raviv as discussed above, including "a mobile communication terminal having a plurality of communication interfaces." Thus, the 102(b) rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn for the same reasons as claim 3.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 4, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fyte in view of Raviv. Claim 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fyte and Raviv, and further in view of Matsugatani (U.S. Publication 2002/0,080,778) and Urabe (U.S. Patent 6,125,282). Applicant respectfully traverses rejections.

Claims 4, 8, and 9

Claim 4 is as follows:

> A mobile communication system comprising:
> a mobile communication terminal including:
> a plurality of communication interfaces;
> a communication interface selecting section which selects a communication interface via which the mobile communication system transmits data, from the plurality of communication interfaces;
> a mobile communication terminal identification address assigning section which assigns a mobile communication terminal

identification address for identifying the mobile communication terminal to data;

a communication interface identification address assigning section which assigns a communication interface identification address for identifying the selected communication interface to the data; and

a transmitting section which transmits the data being assigned with the two kinds of addresses via the selected communication interface; and

a mobile communication managing apparatus including:

a mobile communication terminal side receiving section which receives the data from the mobile communication terminal;

an address storing section which stores an address table in which the mobile communication terminal identification address and the communication interface identification address that are assigned to the received data are associated with each other;

a communication apparatus side transmitting section which transmits the data received by the mobile communication terminal side receiving section to a certain destination;

a communication apparatus side receiving section which receives data being assigned with a mobile communication terminal identification address;

a communication interface detecting section which detects a communication interface identification address that corresponds to the mobile communication terminal identification address being assigned to the data received by the communication apparatus side receiving section based on the address table; and

a mobile communication terminal side transmitting section which transmits the data received by the communication apparatus side receiving section via the detected communication interface.

The cited references do not teach or suggest each and every the limitation of claim 4, including the limitation "a mobile communication terminal including...a communication interface selecting section which selects a communication interface via which the mobile communication system transmits data, from the plurality of communication interfaces" As discussed with the 102 rejections, Fyte doe not teach or suggest the "communication interfaces." Moreover, Raviv is cited by the Action for disclosing limitations relating to the "mobile communication managing apparatus." Thus, Raviv does not remedy the deficiencies of Fyte, and the combination of Fyte and Raviv does not render claim 4 unpatentable.

For the above reasons, the 103(a) rejection of claim 4 should be withdrawn. Claim 8 includes limitations not taught or suggested by the cited references as discussed above, including "A mobile communication method comprising: selecting a communication interface via which the mobile communication terminal transmits data, from a plurality of communication interfaces." Thus, the

103(a) rejection of claim 8 and claim 9, which depend from claim 8, should be withdrawn for the same reasons as claim 4. Allowance of claims 4, 8, and 9 are respectfully requested.

Claim 5

Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and is allowable over the cited references because the combination of Fyte and Raviv with Matsugatani and Urabe do not yield the limitations of claim 4. Matsugatani is cited by the Action for disclosing a switching information section which transmits a switch information signal to the mobile communication managing apparatus when some conditions are met. Urable is cited by the Action for disclosing that the switching information signal being assigned with the mobile communication terminal identification address and a communication interface identification address corresponding to the new communication interface. Neither Matsugatani nor Urabe teach the required limitation lacking in Fyte and Raviv, including "a mobile communication terminal including...a communication interface selecting section which selects a communication interface via which the mobile communication system transmits data, from the plurality of communication interfaces" of claim 4.

Since the combination of Fyte and Raviv with Matsugatani and Urabe does not render claim 4 obvious, claim 5 depending from claim 4 is likewise allowable over the cited references. The 103(a) rejection of claim 5 should thus be withdrawn. Such withdrawal and allowance of claim 5 and are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310)785-4600 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN LOVELLS US L.L.P.

Date: August 13, 2010

By:

Lawrence J. McClure
Registration No. 44,228
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Telephone: 310-785-4600
Facsimile: 310-785-4601